

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Chelsea Yogerst	Team: Squad #11	CCRB Case #: 201601216	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Sunday, 02/14/2016 12:10 AM	Location of Incident: 1850 Jerome Avenue between East 176th Street and Mount Hope Place	Precinct: 46	18 Mo. SOL 8/14/2017	EO SOL 8/14/2017	
Date/Time CV Reported Mon, 02/15/2016 11:18 AM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Call Processing System	Date/Time Received at CCRB Mon, 02/15/2016 11:18 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. SGT Jeffrey Heilig	01065	941886	PBBX SU
2. POM Joseph Signorile	29637	949663	PBBX SU
3. POM Michael Romanello	02483	952185	PBBX SU

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.SGT Jeffrey Heilig	Abuse: Sgt. Jeffrey Heilig stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
B.POM Joseph Signorile	Abuse: PO Joseph Signorile stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
C.POM Michael Romanello	Abuse: PO Michael Romanello stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
D.POM Joseph Signorile	Force: PO Joseph Signorile used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
E.POM Joseph Signorile	Abuse: PO Joseph Signorile frisked § 87(2)(b)	
F.POM Joseph Signorile	Abuse: PO Joseph Signorile searched § 87(2)(b)	
G.POM Joseph Signorile	Force: PO Joseph Signorile used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
H.SGT Jeffrey Heilig	Abuse: Sgt. Jeffrey Heilig threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)	
I.POM Joseph Signorile	Abuse: PO Joseph Signorile searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.	
J.SGT Jeffrey Heilig	Abuse: Sgt. Jeffrey Heilig refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	
K.POM Joseph Signorile	Abuse: PO Joseph Signorile refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	
L.POM Michael Romanello	Abuse: PO Michael Romanello refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	

Case Summary

On February 14, 2016, at approximately 12:01 a.m., § 87(2)(b) was picked up from his residence at § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan by an Uber car driven by § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) requested that § 87(2)(b) take him to his friend's residence at § 87(2)(b) in the Bronx. At 12:10am, the vehicle was pulled over at 1850 Jerome Avenue in the Bronx by Sgt. Jeffery Heilig, PO Joseph Signorile, and PO Michael Romanello, all of the Patrol Borough Bronx (**Allegations A-C**). PO Signorile allegedly grabbed the collar of § 87(2)(b)'s jacket and pulled him out of the back passenger seat of the vehicle (**Allegation D**). PO Signorile patted down § 87(2)(b)'s sweatpants pockets, jacket pockets his chest area and down his legs (**Allegation E**). PO Signorile reached into both of his front sweatpants pockets (**Allegation F**). PO Signorile allegedly struck § 87(2)(b) in the neck area, grabbed onto his shoulders and forcefully turned him around (**Allegations G**). Sgt. Heilig allegedly told § 87(2)(b) that they could arrest him for having an open container of alcohol (**Allegation H**). PO Signorile searched the back of the vehicle (**Allegation I**). § 87(2)(b) allegedly requested the badge number of all three officers but they did not provide them (**Allegation J-L**). The officers did not arrest § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b) or issue them any summonses or documentation.



2016-04-21_10-16-04.mp4

§ 87(2)(b) provided video footage that captures a few seconds of this incident that he recorded on his cell phone.

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- This case was not suitable for mediation because § 87(2)(b) is planning on filing a lawsuit.
- On April 27, 2016, an inquiry was sent to the NYC Comptroller's Office to determine whether § 87(2)(b) has filed a Notice of Claim regarding the incident. The results are pending and will be included in the case file upon their receipt (Board Review 37). On April 22, 2016, an inquiry was sent to the NYC Comptroller's Office to determine whether § 87(2)(b) has filed a Notice of Claim regarding the incident. The results are pending and will be included in the case file upon their receipt (Board Review 29).
- § 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officers CCRB Histories

- This is § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)'s first CCRB complaint (Board Review 22 and 30).
- Sgt. Heilig has been a member of the service for 9 years and has 8 allegations in 3 prior cases. Among these allegations, there are no substantiated allegations § 87(2)(g).
- PO Signorile has been a member of the service for 5 years and has 6 allegations in 3 prior cases. Among these allegations, there are no substantiated allegations § 87(2)(g).
- PO Romanello has been a member of the service for 4 years and has 7 allegations in 5 prior cases. § 87(2)(g) In case

201301175, a refusal to obtain medical treatment allegation was substantiated; the Board recommended charges; PO Romanello was found not guilty after the trial. § 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

Findings and Recommendation

Allegations not Pleaded

- **Question** § 87(2)(b) stated that before he exited the vehicle, PO Signorile asked him if he had anything in his pockets, and § 87(2)(b) admitted he had an open container of alcohol. Although PO Signorile stated that prior to frisking § 87(2)(b) he asked § 87(2)(b) if he had any weapons, § 87(2)(b) never alleged this. § 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)

- § 87(2)(g)



2016-04-21_10-16-04.mp4

Recommendations

Allegation A-Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Jeffrey Heilig stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.

Allegation B-Abuse of Authority: PO Joseph Signorile stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.

Allegation C-Abuse of Authority: PO Michael Romanello stopped the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.

As documented in photos taken of § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle at his residence, he has a decorative object hanging from his rearview mirror (Board Review 12 and 15). The officers consistently stated that they stopped § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle for the VTL infraction regarding the obstructed windshield, which they all noted in their memo books (Board Review 23, 24, 25). It is undisputed that the officers did not issue a summons to § 87(2)(b) regarding the infraction.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that when PO Romanello approached the driver's side of the vehicle, he asked § 87(2)(b) if everything was okay with his passenger and if anything was wrong. He then explained to § 87(2)(b) that he had been pulled over so that they could check his passenger but did not provide any specific reasons why. PO Romanello then requested § 87(2)(b)'s license and paperwork and asked him if § 87(2)(b) was a good guy. § 87(2)(b)

provided the requested documentation and informed PO Romanello that § 87(2)(b) was a good guy and was not causing any problems (Board Review 32).

§ 87(2)(b) stated that he was unable to hear the discussion between PO Romanello and § 87(2)(b). Towards the end of the incident, § 87(2)(b) asked PO Romanello why they had stopped him. PO Romanello told him that it was because there had been reports of cab drivers being robbed in the neighborhood. When § 87(2)(b) asked PO Romanello if he matched the description of someone they were looking for in the neighborhood, he told him that he did not and they were just doing their jobs because there had been reports of robberies (Board Review 33).

The officers all stated that they used their discretion and chose not to issue a summons regarding the obstruction. PO Romanello testified that once he approached § 87(2)(b) he explained to him that he had been stopped because of the obstructed view. PO Romanello did not recall asking § 87(2)(b) about § 87(2)(b) and did not recall § 87(2)(b) ever expressing to him that he felt unsafe with § 87(2)(b) (Board Review 27).

VTL §375 (30) states that it is unlawful to hang anything on or inside a vehicle that obstructs the view of the operator through the windshield (Board Review 34). A vehicle stop due to probable cause of the occurrence of a traffic violation is reasonable detention per the Fourth Amendment even if additional law enforcement purpose ultimately precipitates the stop. Whren v. United States, 517 U.S. 806 (1996) (Board Review 09).

§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation D-Force: PO Joseph Signorile used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) stated he had not noticed § 87(2)(b) make any traffic infractions and asked him what he had done. In response, § 87(2)(b) told him that he did not know. Once they had been pulled over, PO Signorile and Sgt. Heilig approached § 87(2)(b) who was seated in the back of the vehicle on the passenger side. PO Romanello approached § 87(2)(b) on the driver's side. PO Signorile asked § 87(2)(b) where the Uber had picked him up. In response, § 87(2)(b) told him his home address. PO Signorile then asked § 87(2)(b) where he was going. § 87(2)(b) showed him a text message with the address to his friend's apartment because he did not recall the exact address. PO Signorile then opened the back passenger seat door, instructed § 87(2)(b) to get out of the vehicle and asked him if he had anything in his pockets. § 87(2)(b) informed him that he did not have anything other than a closed bottle of Hennessy Privilege in his jacket pocket. The bottle was 275 ML and was approximately half full. While § 87(2)(b) was in the process of exiting the vehicle through the door, PO Signorile grabbed the collar of his jacket and pulled him out of the vehicle. When PO Signorile grabbed § 87(2)(b)'s collar, § 87(2)(b) was half-way out

of the vehicle and was half standing on his own because his right foot was already out of the vehicle. PO Signorile did not say anything to § 87(2)(b) as he pulled him from the vehicle.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that once § 87(2)(b) entered into his vehicle, § 87(2)(b) spoke on his cell phone in a regular tone. § 87(2)(b) did not hear what § 87(2)(b) said or who he spoke to during the conversation but he did not sound angry. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) did not speak to each other during the drive. § 87(2)(b) did not have any problems with § 87(2)(b) and did not believe he was intoxicated. While PO Romanello spoke to § 87(2)(b) an officer opened up the back passenger door of the vehicle and instructed § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle. § 87(2)(b) complied and exited the vehicle on his own. § 87(2)(b) denied that the officer physically removed § 87(2)(b) from the vehicle or grabbed or pulled § 87(2)(b).

PO Signorile stated that upon approaching the passenger side of the vehicle, he observed § 87(2)(b) holding a medium-sized bottle of Hennessy to the left of him. PO Signorile knew that the bottle was open because it was half full. PO Signorile immediately opened the passenger side door and informed § 87(2)(b) that he could not have an open bottle of alcohol in the vehicle. § 87(2)(b) was irate and began to scream and tell him that he could have the bottle of alcohol. § 87(2)(b) also gestured with his hands, which he held in front of him at chest level and raised towards PO Signorile's face. It was possible that § 87(2)(b) was intoxicated because he was yelling and using hand gestures; however, there were no additional reasons why PO Signorile believed he was intoxicated. PO Signorile instructed § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle because he was acting violently and irately and because he was nervous for himself, his partners, and the driver of the vehicle. He also wanted to ensure that § 87(2)(b) did not have any weapons before he spoke to him further. He could not recall how many times he asked § 87(2)(b) to exit the vehicle. PO Signorile could not recall if he had to assist § 87(2)(b) with getting out of the vehicle but denied pulling him by the collar or using any additional form of physical force to remove him from the vehicle (Board Review 26).

Sgt. Heilig stated that while he was standing near the rear driver's side window, he observed PO Signorile speaking to § 87(2)(b). He initially could not hear their conversation but decided to approach the passenger side of the vehicle once he noticed that they had been conversing for a while. Once there, he heard PO Signorile speak to § 87(2)(b) about the fact that he had an open container of alcohol in the vehicle. Sgt. Heilig did not observe the bottle of alcohol. PO Signorile asked § 87(2)(b) to step out of the vehicle because he had an open container of alcohol, which is a violation. § 87(2)(b) initially refused to exit the vehicle and told the officers that he was not drinking the alcohol. The officers attempted to explain to § 87(2)(b) that it didn't matter that he was not drinking it because the mere possession of an open bottle of alcohol in the vehicle is a violation. § 87(2)(b) continued to speak over the officers and had to be asked more than once to exit the vehicle before he finally did. Sgt. Heilig felt unsafe because § 87(2)(b) did not want to exit the vehicle and because § 87(2)(b) continued to yell at them, which he considered to be abnormal behavior. Sgt. Heilig denied that officers assisted § 87(2)(b) out of the vehicle and denied that PO Signorile ever grabbed § 87(2)(b) by his collar while he was exiting the vehicle (Board Review 28).

PO Romanello did not recall if § 87(2)(b) got out on his own or was instructed to exit the vehicle. He denied seeing either of his partners grab § 87(2)(b)'s collar or make physical contact with him as he was getting out of the vehicle.

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation E-Abuse of Authority: PO Joseph Signorile frisked § 87(2)(b)

Allegation F-Abuse of Authority: PO Joseph Signorile searched § 87(2)(b)

It is undisputed that PO Signorile frisked § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) stated that once he was fully out of the vehicle, he stood facing towards PO Signorile and Sgt. Heilig with his back up against the Uber car. PO Signorile patted down the front pockets of his sweatpants, which were located on the left and right side near his waist. The left pants pocket contained § 87(2)(b)'s wallet and the right pants pocket contained his keys and Blistex lip balm. PO Signorile then patted down the two outside pockets on his jacket, which were located on the left and right side near his waist and one interior pocket, which was located on the right side of the jacket. § 87(2)(b) had the bottle of alcohol in the left outside pocket of his jacket but did not have anything else in any of his jacket pockets. PO Signorile also patted down § 87(2)(b)'s chest region. § 87(2)(b) asked PO Signorile why he was searching him. In response, PO Signorile told § 87(2)(b) that he had to ensure that he did not have a gun or a knife on him. PO Signorile then turned § 87(2)(b) around so that he faced towards the vehicle with his arms fully extended forward and so that his hands were spread on the roof of the vehicle. § 87(2)(b) was then patted all the way down his legs. PO Signorile reached into both of the front pockets of § 87(2)(b)'s sweatpants. § 87(2)(b) believed that Sgt. Heilig may have participated in reaching into his pockets, but he could not be sure because he was not facing him. He did not recall the officers saying anything while his pockets were searched. § 87(2)(b) did not recall if the officers removed any items from his pockets and did not recall if the officers had any of his items in their possession.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that PO Signorile and Sgt. Heilig patted down § 87(2)(b)'s clothing and went through all of his pockets including both of the top pockets of his pants and his jacket pockets.

PO Signorile stated that once § 87(2)(b) exited the vehicle, he asked § 87(2)(b) to turn and face the vehicle. PO Signorile asked § 87(2)(b) if he had any weapons on him because § 87(2)(b) had been acting irately by screaming that he was allowed to have an open bottle of alcohol and was gesturing with his hands at chest level and raised towards PO Signorile's face. PO Signorile wanted to ensure that he did not have any weapons that could hurt him, his partners or the taxi driver, while he continued with their discussion. There were no additional reasons why he asked him this question. PO Signorile did not recall if § 87(2)(b) responded to the question. At this time, Sgt. Heilig and PO Romanello had approached PO Signorile and § 87(2)(b) because they could hear that § 87(2)(b) was irate.

PO Signorile then performed a frisk because § 87(2)(b) had been using hand gestures, acting irately and because he wanted to ensure that he did not have any weapons that could hurt him, his partners or the taxi driver, while he continued with their discussion. PO Signorile denied there was any additional reason why he suspected that § 87(2)(b) could have a weapon. PO Signorile quickly patted down § 87(2)(b) on the outside areas of his clothes which included his coat pockets, pants pockets and around his chest. PO Signorile patted down these specific areas because these are areas where people could conceal weapons and because in the past, PO Signorile has pulled weapons from these specific areas. PO Signorile denied that there were any additional reasons why he patted down these specific areas and denied that he observed any bulges on § 87(2)(b). He denied that he patted § 87(2)(b) down anywhere else. Sgt. Heilig did not assist in patting § 87(2)(b) down. While PO Signorile was patting down § 87(2)(b) he remained angry and his demeanor did not change. He continued to yell at PO Signorile. PO Signorile denied that he ever reached inside of § 87(2)(b)'s pockets or removed anything from his person. The bottle of liquor remained in the taxi on the seat.

Sgt. Heilig testified that PO Signorile frisked § 87(2)(b) for their safety because they were standing in close proximity to him, because situations can escalate quickly and because he had committed a violation by having an open container of alcohol. When Sgt. Heilig was asked if there was anything on § 87(2)(b)'s body that led him to suspect that he had a weapon, he stated that § 87(2)(b) was wearing heavy clothes but he wasn't the officer closest to him. Sgt. Heilig could not recall where § 87(2)(b) was frisked other than his waistband and could not recall if PO Signorile reached into § 87(2)(b)'s pockets.

PO Romanello testified that PO Signorile patted § 87(2)(b) down because his actions, which included gesturing with his hands in front of him, making lots of movements, and speaking in a loud and threatening manner, led the officers to believe that he may be concealing a weapon. PO Signorile wanted to ensure that the situation did not escalate and feared for his safety, the safety of his partners and the safety of § 87(2)(b). PO Romanello feared for his safety and suspected § 87(2)(b) of having a weapon because of his actions, demeanor and because he had already committed a violation by having the open container of alcohol.

In People v. Feldman 2014 NY Slip Op 1377 (2014), the court held that the totality of information could justify a frisk, even if each individual action could be innocuous, and in this case, the officer's earlier observation of furtive movements and attempting to stuff something under a seat, the officer's observation that something was protruding from the same seat, and that another civilian in the vehicle began a physical struggle with another officer, caused the officer to reasonably fear for his safety and reasonably believe that the defendant might possess a weapon (Board Review 35). To justify a search, an officer must have probable cause to believe that the person has committed a crime People v. DeBour 40 NY 2d 1010 (1976) (Board Review 10).

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation G-Force: PO Joseph Signorile used physical force against § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) stated that as he was attempting to memorize the license plate number of the officers' vehicle by reciting it out loud, PO Signorile noticed him doing so and subsequently struck him in the neck area. He instructed § 87(2)(b) to look and listen to him while he was talking and proceeded to grab onto his shoulders near his biceps and forcefully turn him around so that the license plate was no longer in his view. § 87(2)(b) acknowledged that he did not obtain any injuries or receive any medical treatment as a result of the force used against him.

§ 87(2)(b) did not allege seeing any officers strike § 87(2)(b) in the neck, grab him by his shoulders or forcefully turn him around. He denied seeing the officers grab or pull § 87(2)(b) during the incident.

PO Signorile denied that he struck § 87(2)(b) in the neck, grabbed him by the shoulders or made any form of physical contact with him other than patting him down. PO Signorile did not recall § 87(2)(b) ever reciting the license plate number out loud and denied that he or his partners ever told § 87(2)(b) to stop memorizing the license plate number.

Sgt. Heilig denied that his partners struck § 87(2)(b) in the neck. He could not recall if his partners ever grabbed § 87(2)(b) by the shoulders or forcefully turned him around. He also did not recall if § 87(2)(b) ever attempted to memorize the license plate of their vehicle.

PO Romanello denied that his partners struck § 87(2)(b) in the neck, forcefully turned him around or grabbed him by the shoulders.

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation H-Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Jeffrey Heilig threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) stated that when Sgt. Heilig told him that he had an open container of alcohol, which is illegal, he responded by telling Sgt. Heilig that he had not consumed any alcohol and that the bottle was small, closed and in his pocket. Sgt. Heilig continuously told § 87(2)(b) that they could arrest him for having an open container because the bottle was not sealed. § 87(2)(b) questioned whether he actually had an open container and asked the officers to just give him a ticket. Sgt. Heilig told § 87(2)(b) that they could not just issue him a ticket and asked him if he wanted to go to jail that night. § 87(2)(b) told Sgt. Heilig that he did not.

§ 87(2)(b) could not hear any of the conversation between § 87(2)(b) and the officers because his window was closed.

Sgt. Heilig tried to explain to § 87(2)(b) that he had committed a violation. § 87(2)(b) continued to yell over Sgt. Heilig as he was attempting to speak to him. Sgt. Heilig did tell § 87(2)(b) that he could get a ticket for having an open container but did not recall telling § 87(2)(b) that he could be arrested for having an open container. Sgt. Heilig explained in his CCRB interview that, in general, when individuals commit any violation, they are breaking the law, and can subsequently be brought back to the station house and arrested. Sgt. Heilig did not recall asking § 87(2)(b) if he wanted to go to jail.

PO Signorile denied hearing Sgt. Heilig threaten to arrest § 87(2)(b) tell him that he could be arrested for having an open container or ask him if he wanted to go to jail that night.

PO Romanello did not recall hearing Sgt. Heilig threaten to arrest § 87(2)(b) tell him that he could be arrested for having an open container or ask him if he wanted to go to jail that night.

VTL §1227 states that any operator or passenger of a vehicle with an open container containing an alcoholic beverage is guilty of this traffic infraction (Board Review 36).

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation I-Abuse of Authority: PO Joseph Signorile searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were occupants.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that either PO Signorile or Sgt. Heilig put his head inside the back of the vehicle and searched the back seats and underneath the floor mats. The officer did not mention what he was looking for. § 87(2)(b) did not see the officer remove anything from his vehicle.

§ 87(2)(b) did not allege that any officers searched § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle.

PO Signorile testified that the back passenger door was open and his head crossed the threshold of the door. He then searched the back of the vehicle in the general area where § 87(2)(b) had been sitting, including underneath the doormats and in between the seats. The vehicle search lasted for less than thirty seconds. PO Signorile searched the back of the vehicle to ensure that there was no weapon in the vehicle. He believed that there may have been a weapon inside the vehicle because § 87(2)(b) had been yelling at the officers and using hand gestures. There were no additional reasons why he believed that there was a weapon inside vehicle. PO Signorile was concerned that if there was a weapon inside the vehicle, § 87(2)(b) may return to the vehicle and use it to take out his frustration on § 87(2)(b). PO Signorile did not find or remove anything from the vehicle.

Sgt. Heilig did not recall if either of his partners searched the vehicle because he was standing towards the back of the vehicle and was focusing all of his energy and attention on trying to speak to § 87(2)(b). When Sgt. Heilig was asked if he believed that there was a weapon inside the vehicle, he stated that his suspicion was raised because § 87(2)(b) did not want to exit the vehicle and because § 87(2)(b) was yelling. He did not recall there being any additional reasons why he believed there may have been a weapon inside the vehicle.

PO Romanello did not recall if either of his partners searched the vehicle and did not recall there being a discussion between him and his partners regarding the fact that there may be a weapon inside the vehicle.

An officer may conduct a limited search of a vehicle if there is a substantial likelihood that a weapon, which presents an actual and specific danger to the officers' safety, is located within the vehicle. People v. Baksh, 2014 NY Slip OP 112 (Board Review 11).

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation J-Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Jeffrey Heilig refused to provide his shield number to

§ 87(2)(b)

Allegation K -Abuse of Authority: PO Joseph Signorile refused to provide his shield number to

§ 87(2)(b)

Allegation L- Abuse of Authority: PO Michael Romanello refused to provide his shield number to

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) stated that he asked PO Signorile and Sgt. Heilig both specifically and more generally for their badge number at least five times but they ignored him. When § 87(2)(b) made the requests, both officers were standing in front of him and were approximately a foot away. He could not recall if he made eye contact with the officers, but believed that they heard his requests because he was speaking clearly, loudly and because he made the requests multiple times. Toward the end of the incident, § 87(2)(b) asked PO Romanello for all of the officers' badge

numbers. PO Romanello was the only officer that responded to § 87(2)(b)'s request for their badge numbers and told him that they would provide them in a second. § 87(2)(b) continued to tell PO Romanello that he needed to see his badge number or some form of identification. PO Romanello told him that that he would provide their badge numbers to him when they were done. A few minutes later, § 87(2)(b) repeated that he needed their badge numbers. PO Romanello told him that he would give him their badge numbers once he returned to the Uber car. Because § 87(2)(b) believed that the officers were going to try and drive away without providing their identification, § 87(2)(b) told the officers that he would remain where he was to wait for them to give him their badge numbers. PO Signorile escorted § 87(2)(b) back to the Uber car and informed him that if he remained in the vehicle, they would give him their badge numbers. PO Signorile returned to the officers' vehicle and simultaneously entered it with Sgt. Heilig and PO Romanello. The officers then immediately drove away from the scene without providing their badge numbers.

§ 87(2)(b) could not hear any of the conversation between § 87(2)(b) and the officers because his window was closed. He denied hearing § 87(2)(b) request the badge numbers or any form of identification from the officers.

Sgt. Heilig and PO Romanello did not recall § 87(2)(b) ever requesting their shield numbers or their partner's shield numbers. They also did not recall denying or seeing their partners deny § 87(2)(b) their shield numbers.

PO Signorile denied that § 87(2)(b) ever requested his or his partner's shield number and denied that he or his partners ever denied § 87(2)(b) their shield numbers.

§ 87(2)(g)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Squad:

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print	Date
Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date

